

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the Application of:

Hyun-kwon CHUNG

Application No. 10/673,368

Group Art Unit: 2135

Confirmation No. 4342

Filed: September 30, 2003

Examiner: Ponnoreay Pich

For: NETWORK ACCESSIBLE APPARATUS, SECURITY METHOD USED BY THE  
APPARATUS, AND INFORMATION STORAGE MEDIUM THAT IS REPRODUCIBLE BY  
THE APPARATUS

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed February 20, 2007, having a shortened period for response set to expire on March 22, 2007, the following remarks are provided.

I. Provisional Election of Claims Pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.142

Applicants provisionally elect Group II in response to the preliminary restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action.

II. Applicants Traverse the Requirement

Insofar as Groups I, III, and IV are concerned, it is believed that claims 1, 2, and 15-48 are so closely related to elected claims 3-14 that they should remain in the same application. The elected claims 3-14 are directed to a security method to selectively issue a command depending on a context. Claims 1-2 are drawn to a security method to generate a context. Claims 15-48 are drawn to an information storage medium and an apparatus to generate content and/or identify whether a command is reliable or unreliable and perform actions based upon the identification. There have been no references cited to show any necessity for requiring restriction and, in fact, it is believed that the Examiner would find references containing both

method and product/apparatus/information storage medium claims in the same field of technology. While it is noted that the Examiner has identified different classifications for the product and method claims, it is believed that classification is not conclusive on the question of restriction. It is believed, moreover, that evaluation of both sets of claims would not provide an undue burden upon the Examiner at this time in comparison with the additional expense and delay to Applicants in having to protect the additional subject matter recited by the Group I, III, and IV claims by filing a divisional application.

MPEP § 803 sets forth the criteria for restriction between patentably distinct inventions. (A) indicates that the inventions must be independent (see MPEP §802.01, §806.04, §808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP §806.05-806.05(i)); and (B) indicates that there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP §803.02, §806.04(a)- §806.04(i), §808.01(a) and §808.02). The Examiner has not set forth why there would be a serious burden if restriction is required.

### III. Conclusion

Upon review of references involved in this field of technology, when considering that the method, storage medium, and/or apparatus recited by the Group I, III, and IV claims is directed to generating a context and selectively issuing commands based on the context, and elected claims 3-14 are directed to selectively issuing commands based on a context, and when all of the other various facts are taken into consideration, it is believed that upon reconsideration of the Examiner's initial restriction requirement, all of the pending claims should be examined in the subject application.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number 503333.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney.


Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date:

3/22/07

By:



Hung H. Bui  
Registration No. 40,415

1400 Eye St., N.W., Ste. 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510